war under Dáúd Khán, Aurangzeb's general, are still remembered by the inhabitants of the district. Mr. Forbes's details prove in a most striking manner the reliability of our Muhammadan historians; the only discrepancies refer to the relationship of several Chero chiefs. His geographical remarks form a valuable commentary on several passages in the *Pádisháhnámah* and the *'Álamgírnámah*, and correct, in one case, a bad reading of the Society's edition of the latter work.

2. Notes on and translation of two Copper-plate inscriptions from Chaibassa, Singbhu'm, *by* Pratapachandra Ghosha.

(Abstract.)

The copper tablets were discovered buried in the ground in the village of Bámanghátí. They record grants of several villages Bámanvastí, &c., to two bráhmans by two princes of the Mayurbhanj family, a family still extant in the Kaṭak Tributary Mahalls. The plates are each surmounted by a seal, bearing the name of the donor, and signs such as the bull, the trident, and the crescent moon. Rájábhanja, the son of Ranabhanja, is the donor mentioned in one tablet and Ranabhanja is the donor of the other. The tablet of Ranabhanja bears a date which is supposed to be 56 Samvat.

3. On two Saurian Genera Eurylepis and Plocederma, Blyth, with a description of a new species of Mabouia, Fitzinger,—*by* Dr. Anderson, Curator, Indian Museum.

In comparing some of the Reptiles in the Indian Museum with the catalogue of that Section prepared by Mr. Theobald for this Society, I have lately made two identifications which it is desirable should be put on record, as they refer to two of Mr. Blyth's genera which have hitherto escaped the notice of Herpetologists. I refer to the two genera *Eurylepis* and *Plocederma*. In Mr. Theobald's Catalogue, no mention is made of either of them, and I can only account for their having been overlooked by the circumstance that they were originally published as foot notes to two consecutive pages of the Journal of this Society for 1854.* The species illus-

* J. A. S. Beng. vol. xxiii, pp. 738-739.

trating the first mentioned so-called genus was referred by Theobald to *Plestiodon* of Dumeril and Bibron, and renamed by him *P. scutatus*, and the other species for which Blyth had suggested the generic term *Plocederma* was placed by Theobald in the genus *Laudakia*, which he regarded as distinct from *Stellio*, and referred to Gray's species *Stellio tuberculatus*.

Before considering the affinities of these two forms I shall first point out the characters of the sub-genus *Eumeces* which Wiegmann, its author, regarded as only a subdivision of his Section *Euprepes*.

In the Catalogue of the Berlin Museum published in 1856* Lichtenstein identified *Plestiodon Aldrovandi*, D. and B., with *Scincus pavimentatus*. P. Geoffroy St. Hilaire†, but justly retained for *P. Aldrovandi*, D and B.‡ Schneider's name *auratum*§ which, even according to Dumeril and Bibron's showing, was entitled by priority to stand for the species to which they had affixed the name of *Aldrovandus*. Prof. Peters‖ was the first after Wiegmann himself to direct attention to the fact that the *S. pavimentatus*, Is. Geoff. St. Hilaire was the type of Wiegmann's sub-genus *Eumeces* and Dr. Stoliczka¶ last year brought Peters' observation to the notice of this Society.

The history of the sub-genus *Eumeces* is as follows: In 1834, Wiegmann** in establishing the genus referred *S. rufescens*, Merr., and *S. punctatus*, Schneider, to it, but in the following year†† he pointed out that these two species did not belong to it. In 1837,‡‡ he indicated that *Eumeces* was intermediate between *Gongylus* and *Euprepes* and that *S. pavimentatus*, Is. Geoff. St. Hilaire, was the only species referable to it, and that it differed from *Euprepes* in the form of its tongue and dentition, but he did not regard these differences as of generic but only of sub-generic

* Nomen. Rept. et Amphib. Musei Zool., Berol., Lichtenstein, p. 19.
† Desc. d l'Egypt, p. 135, pl. 3, fig. 3, pl. 4, fig. 4, 4a.
‡ D. and B. Herpl. Genl. vol. v, p. 701, 704.
§ Schneider, Hist. Amph. Zoo. II, p. 176. Günther places *S. auratus* in *Mabouia* and records it from Persia.
‖ Monats. der Akad. zu Berlin, 1864, pp. 48, 49.
¶ Journ. As. Soc. Beng. 1870. vol xxxix p. 174.
** Herpet Mex. p. 36.
†† Arch. für Naturgesch. (Wieg.) vol. ii, p. 288.
‡‡ Wieg. l. c. vol. v, p. 132.

valuo. He states that the nostrils of *S. pavimentatus* are situated in the centre of a small nasal shield, but in his work on the Herpetology of Mexico be writes, "*naris in medio scutello sitæ (scutellis duobus in unum coalitis)*" which would lead me to conclude that he doubted whether the character of a single nasal shield were a reliable and constant feature. At that time he divided the genus into two small sub-divisions: one Section, *A.* containing *S. pavimentatus* and *S. rufescens*, Merr., the latter of which he afterwards referred to *Euprepes*, and another Section *B.* in which he placed *S. punctatus*, Schneider, and which he also afterwards located in *Euprepes*. The characters of the first sub-division were these, "*palpebra superior mediocris : inferior scutellato squamosa : dentes palatini numerosi.*" It is therefore to be understood that the scales of *Eumeces* (*E. pavimentatus*) were smooth the nostril in a single plate resulting from the coalescence of two nasals, the inferior eyelid scaly, and that it had palatine teeth.

In 1839, Dumeril and Bibron* do not appear to have been aware that Wiegmann had corrected his original mistake and had removed *S. rufescens* and *S. punctatus* from *Eumeces*, for they enter into an elaborate criticism of his arrangement of the genus in his Herpetology of Mexico. They regarded Wiegmann's *Eumeces* as not founded on a sufficient basis and they therefore retained his name simply to apply it to the group represented by the type *S. punctatus* of Schneider, which has a transparent eyelid, a double fronto-parietal and a small unilobular ear. They, however, in the same volume described the genus *Plestiodon* which has all the characters of Wiegmann's first section (*A*) of *Eumeces* as represented by *Eumeces pavimentatus*, Geoff., which Professor Peters states is synonymous with *Scincus Schneideri*, Is. Geoff. St. Hilaire, *Plestiodon Aldrovandi*, D. and B., and *Plestiodon cyprius*, Cuv. Under these circumstances *Plestiodon* cannot stand, as *Eumeces* has the prior claim to acceptance.

Blyth's *Eurylepis* has the palatine teeth and palate of *Eumeces*, as described by Wiegmann, and also the scaly eyelid and smooth scales. The nostril, however, is not in a single plate but is placed between an anterior and posterior nasal shield, and not as described

* Herpet. Genl. vol. v.

by Blyth and Theobald in a small separate nasal shield. The head plates are arranged as in *E. pavimentatus* and the ear has from three to two lobes anteriorly. The only character of importance in which it differs from *Eumeces* as defined by Wiegmann, and illustrated by *E. pavimentatus*, is the occurrence of the nostril between two shields) but keeping in view Wiegmann's statement that the single nasal of *E. pavimentatus* results from the union of two, this singular difference can hardly be considered as generic. I therefore regard *Eurylepis* as another synonym of *Eumeces*, Wiegmann. *Eumeces* thus defined would appear to correspond with Fitzinger's* genus *Mabouia* which like *Eumeces* has a single nasal, a scaly eyelid and palatine teeth, and the palatine groove reaching forward to the eye, so that the only generic distinction that exists between them is the character of the nostril, but if I am correct in regarding that character as not of sufficient importance to separate *Eurylepis* from *Eumeces*, it cannot have more force when we compare *Mabouia* and *Eumeces* and I am therefore inclined to group together these smooth scaled skinks with palatine teeth and scaly eyelids under the first proposed term *Mabouia*, Fitzinger. *Scincus* which has palatine teeth is separated from *Mabouia* by its dilated toes and shovel-like muzzle.

There is this peculiarity in the scales of the this new form that led Blyth to term it *Eurylepis*, *viz.*, that the scales on the middle of the back from on a line with the axilla as far back as on a line with the groin, while they have only the antero-posterior breadth of the scales of the sides of the back and sides, are so much transversely extended that each dorsal scale has the breadth of three of the lateral rows of scales. The middle of the back is thus covered, in the area defined, by a single row of narrow, hexagonal much transversely extended scales. The scales, between the occiput and the enlarged dorsal series, are of the same size as those in the sides. Each dorsal scale, large and small, is marked by shallow grooves† from the number of 3 to 10, or 11, the first number being restricted to the small scales and the latter occurring on the large scales or plates : the smaller scales have each a minute pore. If these grooves were brought together in pairs, they would produce

* Neue Class. der Rept. 1826, p. 23. † D. and B. l. c. v. p. 702.

a keeled character in the scale, so that it would appear that they are perhaps modifications of the carinated form of scales. It should be borne in mind, however, that this form notwithstanding its grooved scales, is a truly smooth scaled scink. To revert, however, to the significance of the large dorsal plates in the form under consideration; it does not appear to me to merit generic status, because another and distinct species has recently come under my observation, in which there are two rows of enlarged dorsal shields, each about half the size of the large scales of the type of *Eurylepis*. *Mabouia* with the foregoing facts before us may be defined as follows :—

MABOUIA, Fitzinger.

Head conical, scales smooth and finely grooved; dorsal scales either of uniform size or enlarged. Tail long, round and smooth without spines; lower eyelid scaly. Nostril either in a single plate or between two plates, an anterior and posterior. Teeth numerous, conical, somewhat laterally compressed. Palatine teeth. Palatine notch broad on a level with the eye. Limbs moderately or well developed, rather for apart. Toes, 5, 5.

The species which has given rise to these remarks may be characterized as follows:

MABOVIA TÆNIOLATA, Blyth.

Eurylepis tæniolatus, Blyth, Journ. As. Soc. xxii pp. 739, 740.
Plestiodon scutatus, Theobald, Cat. Rept. As. Soc. Mus. 1868, pp. 25, 26,
Eumeces scutatus, Theob., Jerdon, Proc. As. Soc. Bengal, 1870, p. 73.

Body rather elongated, limbs moderately developed and far apart, the distance between them equalling five times the interval between the shoulder and ear. Tail $1\frac{2}{3}$rds of the length between the snout and the vent: cylindrical, regularly tapered. Supranasals transversely elongated forming a suture behind the rostral. Frontal transversely octagonal. Post-frontals pentagonal, broad externally but narrowing towards the common, broad, mesial suture. Vertical elongate, oblong; lateral and posterior margins concave. Two small pre-occipitals not forming a suture together, but separated by the point of the anterior extremity of an azygos, arrow-head-shaped occipital, with a moderately sized exoccipital shield, on either side

of it. Two temporals, one above the other between the exoccipital and the posterior margin of the last upper labial. A postocular between the two last labials, before the temporals, and with a small postocular above and two small shields in front of it. Six superciliaries, the third from before backwards being the largest. A rather large pentagonal præocular below the first superciliary. A vertically oblong loreal with its upper margin wedged in between the præfrontal and postfrontals. An hexagonal postnasal over the suture of the first and second labials. Two rows of very small shields between the upper labials and the scaly disk of the lower eyelid. Two transverse chin shields, one before the other, behind the mental, the hindermost being the largest and succeeded by three pairs of large shields, of which the anterior pair form a suture. Ear of moderate size with three or four strong denticulations on its anterior margin, the two uppermost being double the size of the others. A dorsal line of transversely broad, longitudinally narrow, hexagonal scales from over the shoulder to on a line with the groin. These scales are as broad as the three lines of scales external to them, and are obscurely marked by 10 or 11 fine grooves, while the small dorsal scales have three such fine sulci. Twenty-one rows of scales round the middle of the body. Scales on the under surface of the tail enlarged, those on the upper surface the same as on the side of the body. Two large anals separated by an oblique suture. Anterior limb when laid forwards reaches beyond the anterior angle of the eye ; posterior limb reaches only a short way beyond one-third of the distance between the groin and the axilla. Centre of under surface of the feet covered with small tubercles ; a line of larger tubercles on the hind foot embracing the smaller ones, and curving backwards from the outer to the inner toe. About 8 inter-maxillary, and 28 maxillary teeth in the upper jaw, as a whole ; and five palatine teeth on either side.

The specimens are much faded, but the coloration appears to have been a pale olive grey above with a dark brown band running along the large, dorsal scales, and spotted with whitish. A dark brown band along the side from the eye and partially prolonged on to the tail. This band is ornamented at regular intervals with three longitudinal lines of whitish spots. Tail more or less darkly speckled, the markings tending to form transverse rings.

Length:—snout to vent 3,″ 8‴; vent to tip of tail 5,″ 2‴; head 6‴; fore limb 10,‴ hind limb 1″, fourth toe 4.‴

Hab. Punjáb, Salt Range.

Two specimens were collected by Mr. Theobald in the Salt Range of the Punjab, and presented by him to this Society and described by Mr. Blyth who created the above named genus for their reception. There cannot be a doubt as to their identity, but both, Blyth and Theobald, have fallen into some inaccuracies regarding certain of their characters. The former says that the nostril is pierced in a small, separate, nasal shield, an error repeated by Theobald. Mr. Blyth also states that the lower eyelid has a translucent disk, but Mr. Theobald more accurately describes it as scaly, with a transverse row of large plates. He, however, says the body is surrounded by 23 rows of scales while the two specimens exhibit only 21 in the middle of the body, and Blyth limited them to 19.

If I am wrong in my estimate of the value to be attached to the occurrence of the nostril between two plates, and the presence of the enlarged dorsal plates, then Blyth's *Eurylepis* will stand, but for the reasons stated, I do not regard these characters as generic.

MABOUIA BLYTHIANA, n. sp.

Rostral triangular, hexagonal, in contact with the supranasals. Anterior nasal triangular, rather small; posterior shield subquadrangular. Supranasals transversely oblong, forming a suture behind the rostral. Frontal transversely elongate, its anterior margins forming an obtuse angle. Posterior frontals large, hexagonal, forming a broad suture. Vertical elongate, lateral margins slightly convergent posteriorly, hinder margins forming an obtuse angle. Præoccipitals pentagonal, forming a broad suture behind the vertical. An azygos, wedge-shaped occipital. Exoccipitals of moderate size, pentagonal. Three rather large temporals between the exoccipitals and the two last upper labials, one anterior to the other two shields which lie one above the other, the former separated from the eye by a chain of small shields running from the anterior angle of the eye, along the upper eyelid and the lower margin of the eye to its anterior third. Six superciliaries, the first and last very small. A small point-

edly quadrangular, and a large, oblong shield along the anterior third of the lower margin of the eye, the former behind the latter, with a large pentagonal loreal in front of them, and a vertically elongated, hexagonal postnasal before the latter, in contact with the 2nd, upper labial, posterior nasal, supranasal, frontal, postfrontal and loreal. Eight upper labials, the seventh and eighth the largest, the anterior margin of the last on a line with the posterior angle of the eye. Seven lower labials, the last but one the largest. Mental like a labial, but more transversely elongated, with a large, azygos, pentagonal plate behind it, with the concavities of its two hinder margins directed backwards and in contact with two pairs of labials. A pair of transverse shields in contact with the second and third labials and forming a suture together behind the azygos plate ; another large pair with a small azygos shield between the plates, succeeded by another pair with a still smaller pair behind the latter. Thirty rows of smooth scales round the middle of the body. Two longitudinal lines, in the middle of the back, of transversely elongated, hexagonal scales considerably larger than any of the other dorsal or lateral scales, and commencing from behind the occiput and diminishing in size on the root of the tail. Ventrals of moderate size with their posterior margins rounded. Two large præanals with a small external pair. Tail rounded, slightly, laterally compressed, long and tapering, one and two-thirds as long as the body. A single row of enlarged sub-caudals. Scales on the upper surface and sides of the tail of uniform size. Ear moderately large, erectly oval, with from three to four strong lobules on its anterior margin, the uppermost the strongest. Under surface of feet covered with tubercles, those of the hind foot embraced by an enlarged series extending from the base of the first to the base of the fifth toe. Limbs well developed, the fore limb reaching to the tip of the snout, and the hind limb when stretched forwards extending to the anterior third of the space between the axil and groin. Seven intermaxillary and 34 maxillary teeth in the whole of the upper jaw, and 36 in the mandible. Seven to eight palatine teeth on either side. Snout to vent, 3″ 5‴ ; vent to tip of tail 6″; head 7‴ ; fore limb 1″ 1‴; hind limb 1″ 6‴ ; fourth toe 6.‴

Olive brown above ; three dark-brown, longitudinal lines along

the back, from the nape to the base of the tail. A broader dark-brown band from the eye over the tympanum, along the side. A broad, pale-yellowish band below it from below the eye through one half of the tympanum along the sides to the groin. A palish dusky band from the angle of the mouth, over the shoulder, and along the side below the yellowish band. Upper surface and sides of tail pale, uniform brownish-olive. All the under parts yellowish.

Hab. Amritzur? Purchased from a Bokhara merchant who stated that he obtained it at Amritzur.

Blyth* in a notice of some Reptiles from the Panjáb writes of the next form which I purpose to consider, "a well marked second species of Dr. Gray's genus *Laudakia*, founded on *Agama tuberculata* of Hardwicke's Ill. Ind. Zool., if not rather a new genus affined to *Laudakia* (in which case this may bear the name *Plocederma*, nobis)." This specimen is still in the Museum and was referred by Theobald to *Laudakia tuberculata*, Gray, which he considered generically distinct from *Stellio*, and which it does not appear to be. The examples of the genus *Stellio* in the Indian Museum agree with Dr. Günther's figure of *S. indicus* which he afterwards referred to *S. tuberculatus*, Gray. There are, however, two well marked species of the genus in India as Dr. Stoliczka has shown me from the rich materials in his possession, and as he is to describe the result of his observations, I shall proceed to point out the characters of the type specimen of Blyth's supposed genus *Plocederma*, but, to enable me to do so, it is necessary for me to remark that the two species recognized by Dr. Stoliczka are distinguished by the size and distribution of the enlarged scales of the dorsal region. One species *S. tuberculatus* has the scales considerably and generally smaller than the other and more numerous, those on the back of the neck being scarcely enlarged, while in the other, larger-scaled form, the scales in that region partake to a certain extent of the nature of the dorsal scales and are prolonged more or less to the occiput. I am inclined to the conclusion that Blyth's *Plocederma* is a young individual of Dr. Stoliczka's large scaled form, but the following are the characters of Blyth's *S. melanurus*.

* Journ. As. Soc. Beng. xxiii, pp. 737,738.

Stellio melanurus, Blyth.

Laudakia (*Ploiederma*) *melanura*, Blyth, Journ. As. Soc. Beng. 1854, vol. xxiii, p. 737-739.

Laudakia tuberculata, Gray, Theobald, Cat. Rept. As. Soc. Beng., 1868, p. 38.

A short rudimentary crest of enlarged, keeled, tubercular scales. Scales of the back enlarged, imbricate, strongly keeled, with serrated free margins, and with a small apical spine. On the middle of the back, there are 8 rows of the enlarged scales much larger than those external to them which number 7 rows, gradually decreasing from within outwards, the outer row, however, abruptly separated by its greater size from the minute scales of the sides. In the large central rows of scales, the strong keels form longitudinal lines, while in those external to them, the keels form oblique lines, from within outwards. Half way between the middle of the back and the shoulder, the number of rows of enlarged dorsal scales decreases to 16, so that the scales are restricted to a much narrower area than on the back, but before the shoulder there is again a slight augmentation in their distribution, the rows increasing to about twenty, but the scales having diminished in size, the lateral extent covered by them is not much increased. On the back of the neck, there are no enlarged scales besides those of the central crest which begins where the enlarged scales stop, on a line with the shoulder. The scales on the sides of the body are granular, each with a minute apical spine and arranged in transverse lines, and there are no enlarged scales among them. (In this character it differs from *S. tuberculatus*). I count 149 rows of scales round the middle of the body, 53 of which are ventral, smooth and without any trace of keels. The scales on the upper surface of the limbs, with the exception of those on the tail, are the largest, their margins are serrated and each has an apical spine. The scales of the tail are large and arranged in verticils which are interrupted, however, in their curve on the upper surface of the base of the tail. All are keeled and have strong apical spines, with the exception of those in the middle of the under surface of the tail which have no keels, but generally have an apical spine, with a smaller one on each side of it. Nostril above the second and

third labials, but separated from them by two rows of scales. Seventeen upper and fifteen lower labials. A median line of slightly enlarged keeled scales behind the snout, and a similarly enlarged plate on the occiput. Two to three rows of enlarged conical, spined scales from below the eye to the tympanum. A group of tubercular, spinous scales at the anterior margin of the ear. A fold at the under margin of the tympanum prolonged to the neck, on the under surface and sides of which there are numerous folds, those in the latter locality being here and there covered with groups of spines. A pit before the shoulder from the upper anterior margin of which a fold is prolonged over the shoulder to the sides of the back with small spines occurring on it at intervals ; a smaller and more indistinct fold between the latter fold and the shoulder with a few large spinous scales. The opening of the ear is very large and patulous. The tail is slightly dilated at its base and depressed, long and slender and more than twice as long as from the snout to the vent. The wrist reaches as far forwards as the snout, and the hind limb just touches the vent. The third finger is nearly the length of the fourth which is the proportion in the corresponding toes. A small callous patch of about 20 scales in the centre of the abdomen, with a præanal series of two rows of callous scales. A deep depression behind the vent. The dental formula of the upper jaw is premaxillary teeth $3 + 3 = 6$; maxillary teeth $13 + 13 = 26$; total 32. Snout to vent 3″ 2‴ ; vent to tip of tail 7″ 9,‴ head 10‴ ; fore limb 1″ 8‴ ; hind limb 2″ 8‴ ; fourth toe 7‴.

Colour in spirit, I quote from Blyth, " Olive grey, probably olive green and changeable when alive ; the head and body speckled over with dark scales, and also with some scales paler than the rest ; the long slender portion of the tail dusky black and the lower parts pale and buffy white, apparently suffused with crimson when alive ; the throat and below the shoulders beautifully marbled with greyish black, probably blue in the living animal."

Blyth states that the locality from whence the specimen was obtained was uncertain, but that he believed it to come from Kashmir. Mr. Theobald, however, who collected the specimen states in his Catalogue that it came from Simla.

4. Notes on some Indian and Burmese Ophidians, *by* Dr. F. Stoliczka.

(Abstract.)

In this paper notes are given of the following species : *Typhlops Horsfieldi*, *T. bothriorhynchus*, *T. braminus* and *T. pammeces*.

T. porrectus, n. sp.—18 longit. rows of scales ; 406-440 transverse rows on body, 11-12 on the tail ; head-shields regular ; eye very indistinct ; circumference $\frac{1}{24}$ to $\frac{1}{27}$ of length of body ; leaden or olivaceous brown above, paler below and on the head ; mouth and below tail pure white. Bengal and N. W. Provinces.

T. Andamanensis, n. sp.—18 longit. rows of scales, about 390 transverse rows on body and 17 on the tail ; head shields above regular ; one separate lower præ-ocular and one sub-ocular ; 4 labials, the third larger than the fourth ; circumference a little less than $\frac{1}{16}$th of total length ; eye indistinct ; blackish brown above, vinaceous on side, grey, checkered with white, below. Andaman islands.

T. Theobaldanus, n. sp.—22 long. rows of scales ; 485 transverse rows on body, 26 on the tail ; circumference $\frac{1}{26}$ of the total length ; head-shields regular ; eyes perfectly indistinct ; uniform light brown ; India.

Simotes bicatenatus.—Ablabes collaris.—Compsosoma Hodgsoni.—Zamenis fasciolatus.—Tropidonotus quincunctiatus. Of this last species a variety is described and figured, with the posterior frontals united into one shield.

T. bellulus, n. sp.—19 rows of small, sharply carinate, scales, head-shields like in the last species, but the anterior frontals more obtuse in front, 9 upper labials of which the 4th, 5th and 6th enter the orbit, 1+2 temporals ; 140 ventrals, 63 subcaudals ; olive brown above with two series of little dark spots along the back, all ventrals black at the base ; Pegu (Mr. S. Kurz).

T. Himalayanus.—T. junceus.—T. subminiatus. A unicoloured large variety is figured and described of the last species.

T. macrops, Blyth, is the same as *T. macrophthalmus*, Günther, and most probably also identical with *T. Sikkimensis*, Anderson.

T. plumbicolor from Qualior.

Psammophis condanurus. The N. W. Sub-Himalayan variety is possibly the same as *P. Leithii* of Günther, from Sind.

Dipsas Forsteni occurs at Pankabaree, base of Sikkim hills.

D. hexagonotus, Bl., is not identical with *D. multifasciata*, Bl., as suggested by Dr. Anderson.

D. bubalina is common in the low valleys of Sikkim.

D. trigonata from Qualior.

Leptorhytaon jara is not considered to be generically distinct from *Lycodon*.

Hypsirhina enhydris has sometimes 23 rows of scales.

Trimeresurus Andersoni of Theobald is quite distinct from *T. monticola* with which it was wrongly identified by Dr. Anderson. It is an Andaman species, and allied to *T. porphyraceus* of Blyth.

[This paper will be published with illustration in the Natural History Part of the Journal for the current year].

5. Notes on new or little known Indian Lizards, *by* Dr. F. Stoliczka.

(Abstract.)

After some preliminary remarks, the author gives notes on the following, known or new, species :—

Lacertidæ.

Tachydromus sexlineatus, and the allied species *T. meridionalis*, *T. Haughtonianus** and *T. septemtrionalis*.—*Ophiops Jerdoni*, Blyth, = *Pseudophiops Jerdoni* = *Ps. Theobaldi* and ? = *Ps. Beddomei* of

* The naming of this species was the cause of a most unjustifiable attack by Dr. Anderson upon Dr. Jerdon, as recorded by the former in the Proc. of the Zool. Soc. of London for 1871, p. 156. I do not wish to repeat that presumptuous statement, which has justly elicited the indignation of naturalists at home; but a reference to p. 72 of the Society's Proceedings for February 1870 will shew, that it was I who originally gave that information to Dr. Jerdon, as recorded by him (l. cit.). The specimen, for which the new name was proposed, was received during my temporary tenure of the office as Curator of the Indian Museum, and as such I thought it *right* in communicating the information to Dr. Jerdon, whom I knew to be engaged in the preparation of a monograph of the Indian Reptiles. A few points of minor importance in the identification of the species have been afterwards compared by Dr. Jerdon, with the knowledge of one or the other of the officers of the Museum. The name *Haughtonianus* has been adopted by Jerdon on my suggestion.—Of all this Dr. Anderson should, or might, have been aware. But if he wishes to style himself a "Director" of the Museum, why should he be so anxious to apply Dr. Jerdon's statement "with the concurrence of the Curator" to himself? The monopoly of naming and describing specimens in a public Museum, which Dr. Anderson appears to claim as his exclusive right, has fortunately not yet been made law in the Indian Museum at Calcutta.